



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.            | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|
| 10/537,871   | 07/27/2005  | Thomas Goebel        | H-32814A                       | 6784             |
| 74479  | 7590        | 08/11/2009           |                                |                  |
| Novartis Animal Health US Inc.<br>3200 Northline Avenue, Suite 300<br>Greensboro, NC 27408 |             |                      | EXAMINER<br>SCHLENTZ, NATHAN W |                  |
|  |             |                      | ART UNIT                       | PAPER NUMBER     |
|  |             |                      | 1616                           |                  |
|  |             |                      | MAIL DATE                      | DELIVERY MODE    |
|  |             |                      | 08/11/2009                     | PAPER            |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

|   |  |                                      |  |
|---|--|--------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b><br>10/537,871   | <b>Applicant(s)</b><br>GOEBEL ET AL. |  |
|   | <b>Examiner</b><br>Nathan W. Schlientz | <b>Art Unit</b><br>1616              |  |

  

**All Participants:**

(1) Nathan W. Schlientz.

(2) Amy H. Fix.

**Date of Interview:** 3 August 2009

**Type of Interview:**

☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant    ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes    ☒ No  
If Yes, provide a brief description: .

**Status of Application:** pending

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Time:** 3:20

  

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:  
*none*

Claims discussed:  
*21 and 29*

Prior art documents discussed:  
*none*

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:  
*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  

/Johann R. Richter/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1616  
/Nathan W Schlientz/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1616

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner inquired why the scope of the compounds in claim 29 (i.e., claims drawn to a compound of Formula I) was more narrow than the scope of the compounds in claim 21 (i.e., claims drawn to a composition comprising a compound of Formula I). The scope of the compounds in claim 21 encompass compounds that are not encompassed by the scope of the compounds in claim 29 because the position R has differing scopes. Attorney Fix informed the examiner that the scope of claim 29, the compound claim, is directed to the more preferred embodiments whereas the scope of claim 21, the composition claim, is directed to the more broad disclosure in the specification.